REMARKS

Claims 5-6, 9-14, 17 and 19 are in this application. New claim 19 relates to matter included in originally filed claims 1, 2, 4 7 and 11, for example and is now the sole independent claim. Support for new claim 19 may be found, for example, in the illustrated embodiment of Figure 1 and the associated description.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Cancellation of claims 16 and 18 renders this rejection moot.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102

Claims 1-3, 5, 6 and 15 are rejected under U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Perrott (US 6856206).

By this amendment, claims 1,2,3 and 15 are canceled, rendering this rejection moot in relation thereto. Claims 5 and 6 are made dependent on new independent claim 19.

As noted in the Office Action under the section relating to claim rejections under 35 USC § 103, Perrott fails to teach that the fixed capacitors are arranged in a logarithmic scale. This feature is included in claim 19. Thus, claim 19 is not anticipated by Perrott and it follows that dependent claims 5 and 6 are also not anticipated by this reference.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perrott in view of Tham et al (US 5 880 921).

Claim 4 is canceled by this amendment. However, the limitations of claim 4 are incorporated into new claim 19. Thus the patentability of claim 19 with regard to Perrott and Tham is addressed.

Claim 19 requires that a first variable capacitor is connected in the signal path between rf input and output ports, having its first electrode connected to the input port and its second electrode connected to the output port. Claim 19 also requires that second fixed capacitors are switchable into or from the signal path, in parallel to and across the first variable capacitor. Considering Perrott, it can be seen that interpreting the array of soft-switched capacitors in figure 4A to comprise a "first variable capacitor" and the second array of capacitors 416 as a plurality of individually switchable capacitors does not meet these requirements. Thus, even if the second array of capacitors 416 of Perrott were to be arranged on a logarithmic scale, this would not lead to the present invention as claimed by claim 19.

Furthermore, Tham appears to teach that a bank of capacitors with a logarithmic behavior is an alternative to providing a bank of capacitors of equal value so as to give a linear behavior (column 1, lines 39-43). There appears to be no suggestion that a different arrangement might be used, in which a plurality of capacitors are arranged in a logarithmic scale and another capacitor matching the lowest range of the logarithmic scale is provided to act with the plurality. Thus, for this reason also, any combination of the teachings of Perrott and Tham would not lead to the present invention as claimed in claim 19.

It is submitted that claim 19 is patentable over any combination of Perrott and Tham. The remaining claims are directly or indirectly dependent on claim 19 and thus are also allowable for this reason at least.

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
Wolfgang Franz Eckl et al.

By _____
Martin I. Finston, Attorney
Reg. No. 31613
908-582-2908.

Date: 7-18-06

Docket Administrator (Room 3J-219)
Lucent Technologies Inc.
101 Crawfords Corner Road
Holmdel, NJ 07733-3030